

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to applicant's Argument and Amendments filed on 02/22/2008. The applicant amended claims 30 and 51 and cancelled claims 31, 48-50, 59, and 60. Claims 1-30, 32-38, 47, 51-58 are currently pending in this application.

All previous objections and rejections directed to the Applicant's disclosure and claims not discussed in this Office Action have been withdrawn by the Examiner.

#### ***Change of Examiner***

2. It should be noted that the Examiner of record for this application has changed from Joel Stoffregen to Paras Shah.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-17, filed 02/22/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 20, 30, 47, 51, and 57 under Wyard in view of Wilcox *et al.* have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made using Wyard in view of Lin (US 6,675,159).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 US.S.C 101 because the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 9 are drawn to a computer readable medium for enhancing a source corpus. To be statutory, a claimed process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation for which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application which produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result. See Diehr, 450 U.S. at 183-184, 209 USPQ at 6 (quoting Cochrane V. Deener, 84 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) ("A [statutory] process is a mode of treatment of certain materials to produce a given result. It is an act, or a series of acts, performed upon the subject matter to be transformed and reduced to a different state or thing.... The process requires things should be done with certain substances, and in a certain order; but the tools to be used in doing this may be of secondary consequence."). In the present case, the beginning step involves the receiving of signals, as well as the final step of reporting does not result in a generation of a result. Rather, the presently claimed invention neither performs a transformation, nor actively produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, claims 57 and 58 are directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claim 51** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LIN et al. (6,675,159).

8. Regarding **claim 51**, LIN et al. teaches an intelligent agent used in a document management method comprising:

a program including a tagging subroutine operating under parameters (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged), said parameters (see col. 21, lines 45-53, tagged with parameters of noun, verb, etc.) causing the program to search and directing the tagging subroutine to tag language objects within the corpus (see col. 21, lines 45-53, sentences contained in the repository are tagged with the parameters for each word.)

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1, 30, 32, 35-38, 52-58** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WYARD et al. (6,167,398) in view of Lin *et al.* (US 6,675,159).

11. Regarding **claim 1**, WYARD teaches a method of document management utilizing document corpora comprising:

gathering a source corpus of documents in electronic form (“reference corpus can be constituted by two or more documents taken collectively”, WYARD, column 7, lines 32-34);

modeling the source corpus to identify corpus enhancement parameters (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37);

programming the corpus enhancement parameters into an intelligent agent (“the agent 16, processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37); and

using the intelligent agent to search external repositories (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38) to find similar terms and structures (“dissimilarity metrics will be applied to the candidate document”, WYARD, column 7, lines 39-41), and return them to the source corpora, whereby the source corpus is enhanced to form a unicorpus (“the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level”, WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58).

However, WYARD does not disclose modeling the source corpus in terms of document and domain structure information and using a metalanguage to electronically tag the source corpus.

In the same field of document management, LIN et al. teaches: modeling the source corpus in terms of document (LIN, col. 10, lines 48-52, Bayes classifier is used to classify documents) and domain structure information (LIN, col. 19, lines 12-21, corpus is modeled based on clustering documents based on feature map); and using a metalanguage to electronically tag the source corpus (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tags of Lin to derive the weights of WYARD so information retrieval is more precise in order to return documents pertinent to the concept searched (see LIN col. 6, lines 38-40 and lines 43-45).

12. Regarding **claim 30**, WYARD teaches a document management method comprising:

constructing models (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37) of a source corpus of documents (“reference corpus can be constituted by two or more documents taken collectively”, WYARD, column 7, lines 32-34);

deriving parameters from said models for the operation of an intelligent agent (“the agent 16, processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37) over at least one external document repository (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38); and enhancing the source corpus of documents by adding selected documents retrieved by the intelligent agent to form an artificially enhanced corpus (“the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level”, WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58).

However, WYARD does not disclose tagging the objects within the artificially enhanced corpus to allow for identification, description, and retrieval of the objects.

In the same field of document management, LIN *et al.* teaches: tagging the objects within the artificially enhanced corpus to allow for identification, description, and retrieval of the objects (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tags of LIN on the weighted documents of WYARD so information retrieval is more precise in order to return documents pertinent to the concept searched (see LIN col. 6, lines 38-40 and lines 43-45).

13. Regarding **claim 32**, WYARD and LIN *et al.* teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 30.

However WYARD and LIN et al. do not disclose replicating the artificially enhanced corpus in a second language.

In the same field of document management, PETERS teaches replicating the artificially enhanced corpus in a second language (“translating the entire collections of documents into another language”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the translation of PETERS on the reference corpus of WYARD in order to better “match documents and queries over languages” (PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

14. Regarding **claim 35**, WYARD further teaches linking the artificially enhanced corpora to at least one other artificially enhanced corpus using a peer-to-peer network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

15. Regarding **claim 36**, WYARD further teaches that the intelligent agent adds documents to the artificially enhanced corpus (“the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level”, WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58) from another artificially enhanced corpus located on the peer-to-peer network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

16. Regarding **claim 37**, WYARD further teaches that the external document repository includes the internet (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

17. Regarding **claim 38**, WYARD further teaches that the external document repository includes other corpora resident on a peer-to-peer network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

18. Regarding **claim 52**, WYARD teaches an intelligent agent for searching external corpora comprising:

a processor having search parameters programmed to search external corpora according to the parameters for content (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38), and selectively retrieve the content (“agent 16 retrieves a first candidate document”, WYARD, column 14, line 41).

However, WYARD does not disclose tagging the content identified in the search. In the same field of document management, LIN teaches:

tagging the content identified in the search (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tags of LIN on the weighted documents of WYARD so information retrieval is more precise in order to return documents pertinent to the concept searched (see LIN col. 6, lines 38-40 and lines 43-45).

19. Regarding **claim 53**, LIN further teaches that the content includes document structures (see col. 21, lines 43-44 and col. 14, lines 23-25, documents retrieved).

20. Regarding **claim 54**, LIN further teaches that the content includes document models (see col. 25, lines 50-col. 26, lines 14, attributes from the documents' contents are classified and then tagged (see col. 26, lines 15-16).

21. Regarding **claim 55**, LIN further teaches that the content includes objects (see col. 21, lines 41-54, sentence containing specific word objects are retrieved).

22. Regarding **claim 56**, LIN further teaches that the content includes concepts (see 25, lines 50-col. 26, lines 14, words are classified and then tagged, i.e. the document contains financial concepts are determined and then tagged).

23. Regarding **claim 57**, WYARD teaches computer readable media tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a computer to perform a method of enhancing a source corpus in a document management system comprising:  
receiving electronic signals representing first parameters regarding the source corpus ("processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights", WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37); and

searching external document repositories according to the first parameters (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38) to identify information in the external document repositories according to the first parameters (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37).

However, WYARD does not disclose parameters including document structure and document domain information and reporting the tagged information for selective retrieval of the tagged information.

In the same field of document management, LIN teaches parameters including document structure (LIN, col. 19, lines 12-21, corpus is modeled based on clustering documents based on feature map) and document domain information (LIN, col. 10, lines 48-52, Bayes classifier is used to classify documents) and reporting the tagged information for selective retrieval of the tagged information (see col. 26, lines 49-62, query from user is sent to an ontological parser, where the tagged information is matched to the document for retrieval of the document.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tags of LIN on the weighted documents of WYARD so information retrieval is more precise in order to return documents pertinent to the concept searched (see LIN col. 6, lines 38-40 and lines 43-45).

24. Regarding **claim 58**, WYARD and LIN further teach that the method further comprises:

analyzing the tagged information to create a heuristic model (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37) defining document domain (LIN, col. 10, lines 48-52, Bayes classifier is used to classify documents) and document structure information (LIN, col. 19, lines 12-21, corpus is modeled based on clustering documents based on feature map)

causing electronic signals representing the second parameter to be reported to a document management server to update said first parameters (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37).

25. **Claims 2-29, 33 and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WYARD et al. (6,167,398) in view of Lin et al. (US 6,675,159), and in further view of PETERS et al. (*Across Languages, Across Cultures*).

26. Regarding **claim 2**, WYARD and LIN et al. teach all of the claimed limitations of claim 1. However WYARD and LIN et al. do not disclose replicating the unicorpus in at least one language other than the language of the unicorpus.

In the same field of document management, PETERS teaches replicating the unicorpus in at least one language other than the language of the unicorpus (“translating the entire collections of documents into another language”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the translation of PETERS on the reference

corpus of WYARD in order to better “match documents and queries over languages” (PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

27. Regarding **claim 3**, PETERS further teaches that unicorpus replication includes translating terms in the unicorpus with a machine dictionary (“full machine translation”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

28. Regarding **claim 4**, PETERS further teaches that unicorpus replication further comprises performing an analysis of terms surrounding an undefined term to translate the undefined term (“exploit context for disambiguation”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

29. Regarding **claim 5**, PETERS further teaches that the analysis includes performing a natural language analysis (“exploit context for disambiguation”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

30. Regarding **claim 6**, PETERS further teaches that the analysis includes a statistical analysis (“observed statistics of term usage”, PETERS, p. 8, section 3.3).

31. Regarding **claim 7**, WYARD and LIN et al. further teach mining the unicorpus (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37), wherein mining includes locating tagged objects within the unicorpus

(see col. 26, lines 50-62, query inputted by user is tagged and compared to the document containing similar structure in order to return results to user).

32. Regarding **claim 8**, LIN further teaches that mining of the unicorpus includes extraction of concept systems (see col. 26, lines 50-62, query inputted by user is tagged and compared to the document containing similar structure in order to return results to user, specifically documents are returned (concept system)).

33. Regarding **claim 9**, LIN further teaches that the extraction of concept systems includes determining semantic relations between individual concepts (“see col. 27, lines 1-15, synonyms and higher level concepts used to find documents with similar information as query).

32. Regarding **claim 10**, WYARD and PETERS further teach replicating the unicorpus in at least one other language to form a second unicorpus (“translating the entire collections of documents into another language”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1), wherein the second unicorpus is mined to obtain useful objects in the other language (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37).

33. Regarding **claim 11**, WYARD further teaches that the mining is performed selectively to assist in a task (“divides the reference corpus into two portions”, WYARD, column 14, lines 18-19).

34. Regarding **claim 12**, WYARD further teaches that said task includes authoring a document (“retained text file 18”, WYARD, column 14, line 45).

35. Regarding **claim 13**, WYARD further teaches that said task includes content based searching (“performs information retrieval”, WYARD, column 7, lines 15-16).

36. Regarding **claim 14**, WYARD further teaches that said task includes document management (“the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level”, WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58).

37. Regarding **claim 15**, WYARD further teaches that said task includes content management (“the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level”, WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58).

38. Regarding **claim 16**, PETERS further teaches that said task includes translation (“translating the entire collections of documents into another language”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

39. Regarding **claim 17**, PETERS further teaches that said translation includes corpus based machine translation (“full machine translation”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

40. Regarding **claim 18**, WYARD further teaches providing access to the unicorpus over a peer-to-peer network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

41. Regarding **claim 19**, WYARD further teaches that at least two unicorpora are connected via the peer-to-peer network, such that sharing of resources occurs between the unicorpora (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

42. Regarding **claim 20**, WYARD teaches a global documentation method comprising:

modeling a source corpus to determine search parameters (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37);  
providing the search parameters to an intelligent agent (“the agent 16, processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37);

enhancing the source corpus by accessing resources outside of the source corpus with the intelligent agent (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW

servers", WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38), where said intelligent agent retrieves resources according to the search parameters to create a first unicorpus of documents ("the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level", WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58); and selectively mining at least one unicorpus to perform a selected task ("processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights", WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37).

However, WYARD does not disclose tagging the modeled source corpus.

In the same field of document management, LIN et al. teaches:

tagging the modeled source corpus (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tags of LIN to derive the weights of WYARD so information retrieval is more precise in order to return documents pertinent to the concept searched (see LIN col. 6, lines 38-40 and lines 43-45).

However WYARD and LIN et al. do not disclose replicating the unicorpus in at least one other language to form a second unicorpus.

In the same field of document management, PETERS teaches replicating the unicorpus in at least one other language to form a second unicorpus ("translating the entire collections of documents into another language", PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the translation of PETERS on the reference

corpus of WYARD in order to better “match documents and queries over languages” (PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

43. Regarding **claim 21**, WYARD further teaches providing access to at least one unicorpus via a shared network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

44. Regarding **claim 22**, WYARD further teaches that said shared network is a peer-to-peer network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

45. Regarding **claim 23**, WYARD further teaches routing documents between unicorpora connected on the peer-to-peer network to a user (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

46. Regarding **claim 24**, WYARD further teaches tracking the routing of the documents (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

47. Regarding **claim 25**, WYARD further teaches managing rights to the documents routed across the peer-to-peer network (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38).

48. Regarding **claim 26**, PETERS further teaches that the first unicorpus has a plurality of terms wherein replicating includes prepopulating the second unicorpus by using machine translations of at least a portion of said first unicorpus terms (“using both full MT translations and term translations”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

49. Regarding **claim 27**, PETERS further teaches that prepopulating further comprises analyzing the machine translated terms to define remaining terms in the first unicorpus (“exploit context for disambiguation”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

50. Regarding **claim 28**, PETERS further teaches that analyzing includes a statistical analysis of terms adjacent to the untranslated terms (“observed statistics of term usage”, PETERS, p. 8, section 3.3).

51. Regarding **claim 29**, PETERS further teaches that analyzing includes performing a natural language analysis of the first unicorpus terms (“exploit context for disambiguation”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

52. Regarding **claim 33**, LIN further teaches tagging objects within the corpora according to the alignment (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged)..

However, Wyard and LIN do not specifically teach the cross linguistic alignment of the second language.

PETERS teaches performing cross-linguistic alignment of the second language artificially enhanced corpus and the first artificially enhanced corpus (“documents are aligned”, PETERS, p. 8, section 3.3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the translation of PETERS on the reference corpus of WYARD in order to better “match documents and queries over languages” (PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

53. Regarding **claim 34**, WYARD further teaches prepopulating terminology management and translation memory management components of a computer-assisted translation workstation with the objects tagged in the second language artificially enhanced corpus (“using both full MT translations and term translations”, PETERS, p. 6, section 3.1).

54. **Claim 47** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WYARD et al. (6,167,398) in view of Lin et al. (US 6,675,159) and in further view of HARTRICK et al. (5,532,920).

55. Regarding **claim 47**, WYARD teaches a document management system operating according to a business method comprising:

providing document management services including translation and authoring services (“adapted for use in a speech recognition system to provide an LM”, WYARD, column 14, lines 5-6) over a global information network to a customer (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38), where the customer has a source corpus of documents to be managed (“reference corpus can be constituted by two or more documents taken collectively”, WYARD, column 7, lines 32-34); and

accessing the source corpus with an intelligent agent to analyze the source corpus (“processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37) and identify selected objects within the source corpus (“agent 16 retrieves a first candidate document”, WYARD, column 14, line 42), wherein the analysis results in the generation of document parameters programmed into the intelligent agent (“the agent 16, processes the retrieved reference document to derive four weights”, WYARD, column 7, lines 36-37) for searching of external document repositories (“directs the agent 16 to a list of relevant WWW servers”, WYARD, column 14, lines 37-38), wherein said intelligent agent uses said parameters to identify objects of interest in said external document repositories (“agent 16 retrieves a first candidate document”, WYARD, column 14, line 42) and selectively retrieve the objects to enhance the source corpus (“the reference corpus is combined with at least the search document having the highest relevance level”, WYARD, column 13, lines 56-58).

However, WYARD does not disclose tagging the selected objects with a metatag. In the same field of document management, LIN et al. teaches tagging the selected

objects with a metatag (LIN column 14, lines 25-28. and col. 21, lines 40-54, objects within a sentence are tagged).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tags of LIN et al. on the documents of WYARD so information retrieval is more precise in order to return documents pertinent to the concept searched (see LIN col. 6, lines 38-40 and lines 43-45).

However WYARD and LIN et al. do not disclose tracking rights in said retrieved objects to determine a royalty payable to an owner of the rights.

In the same field of document management, HARTRICK teaches tracking rights in said retrieved objects to determine a royalty payable to an owner of the rights ("management of copying and printing operations ... so as to comply with royalty payment requirements", HARTRICK, column 1, lines 12-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the royalty payments of HARTRICK with the management system of WYARD in order to prevent free copying (see HARTRICK, column 2, lines 64-65).

### ***Conclusion***

56. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Srinivasa et al. (US 6,965,900) is cited to disclose extraction of information using an agent. Castellanos (US 7,139,695) is cited to disclose documents tagged according to parts of speech and then grouped. Tsourikov et al. (US 2001/0014852) is cited to

disclose processing documents into SAO structures. Imielinski *et al.* (US 2002/0013792) is cited to disclose virtual tagging. Kearney *et al.* (US 2002/0103835) construction of document models utilizing tags. Perro *et al.* (US 2002/0152202) is cited to disclose tagging text for information retrieval. Davidson *et al.* (US 20030105745) is cited to disclose relating databases using tags.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PARAS SHAH whose telephone number is (571)270-1650. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-THURS. 7:00a.m.-4:00p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571)272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paras Shah/

Application/Control Number: 10/073,516  
Art Unit: 2626

Page 24

Examiner, Art Unit 2626

05/19/2008

/Patrick N. Edouard/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626